

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 23, 2004 (the "Office Action"). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-9, 13-22, 26-30, 31-39, 45-52, 56-60, 61-69, 73-82, 95-96 and 98-102 were pending in the Application. The Office Action rejects Claims 1-9, 13-22, 26-30, 31-39, 45-52, 56-60, 61-69, 73-82, 95-96 and 98-102. To further advance prosecution, Applicants amend Claims 1, 9, 19-20, 22, 26, 30-31, 39, 49-50, 52, 56, 60-61, 69, 79-80, and 82 and cancel Claims 2-8, 13-18, 21, 29, 32-38, 43-48, 51, 59, 62-68, 73-78, 81, 95-96, and 98-102. Thus, Claims 1, 9, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30-31, 39, 49, 50, 52, 56-58, 60-61, 69, 79, 80, 82, 103-110 are now pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 9, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30-31, 39, 49-50, 52, 56-58, 60-61, 69, 79-80 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,622,016 by Sladek et al. ("*Sladek*"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended Claim 1 recites "monitoring the content of communications with the mobile device," "detecting in the content a predefined event associated with a wireless data call service," "initiating the service for the wireless data call in response to detecting the predefined event in the content," "wherein the predefined event comprises a match of a uniform resource locator (URL) requested for access by the mobile device with a particular URL" and "wherein the wireless data call service comprises a web service associated with the URL requested for access." Claims 31 and 61 include similar elements. In rejecting original Claim 2, the Examiner cites to column 17, line 55 through column 18, line 10 of *Sladek*. This portion of *Sladek* discloses the ability of a mobile subscriber to provision a voice-mail service, through a wireless access protocol Internet connection. *See Sladek*, col. 17, line 55 - col. 18, line 10. However, merely allowing a subscriber to provision a voice mail service through an Internet connection does not disclose, teach or suggest detecting in monitored content of communications with the mobile device a match of a URL requested for access by the mobile device with a particular URL and initiating a web service that is associated with the URL requested for access. Therefore, for at

least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 31 and 61 are patentable over *Sladek* and request that the rejection of Claim 1, 31 and 61 be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 19-20, 22, 26-28 and 30 each depends, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1; Claims 39, 49-50, 52, 56-58 and 60 each depends, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 31; and Claims 69, 79-80 and 82 each depends, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 61. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 1, 31 and 61, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 9, 19-20, 22, 26-28, 30, 39, 49-50, 52, 56-58, 60, 69, 79-80 and 82 be withdrawn.

Claim 19 recites "wherein the web service comprises denying the mobile device access to the web site of the URL requested for access." Claims 49 and 79 recite similar elements. In rejecting original Claim 19, the Examiner cites to portions of *Sladek* disclosing providing connectivity to a wireless subscriber station over a packet-switched network and allowing a subscriber to provision a service through an Internet connection. *See* Office Action, page 5 and *Sladek*, col. 11, lines 10-22 and col. 17, line 55 - col. 18, line 44. However, neither this portion nor any other portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests monitoring content of mobile device communications on a data call and denying the mobile device access to a URL requested for access based on a detected match of the requested URL with a particular URL. For at least these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 19, 49 and 79 are patentable over *Sladek* and request that the rejection of Claims 19, 49 and 79 be withdrawn.

Claim 20 recites "wherein the web service comprises automatically redirecting the mobile device to a different URL than the URL requested for access." Claims 50 and 80 recite similar elements. In rejecting original Claim 20, the Examiner cites to the same portions of *Sladek* discussed above, namely those disclosing providing connectivity to a wireless subscriber station over a packet-switched network and allowing a subscriber to provision a service through an Internet connection. *See* Office Action, page 5 and *Sladek*, col. 11, lines 10-22 and col. 17, line 55 - col. 18, line 44. However, neither this portion nor any other portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests monitoring content of mobile device communications on a data call and automatically redirecting the mobile device to a different URL than the URL requested for access

based on a detected match of the requested URL with a particular URL. For at least these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 20, 50 and 80 are patentable over *Sladek* and request that the rejection of Claims 20, 50 and 80 be withdrawn.

Claim 22 recites "wherein the web service comprises billing a user of the mobile device for accessing the URL requested for access." Claims 52 and 82 recite similar elements. In rejecting original Claim 22, the Examiner cites to portions of *Sladek* disclosing a process by which billing for a subscriber's calls may be transferred to a third party, such as a hotel. The process can be implemented by sending data over an IP network. *See* Office Action, page 5 and *Sladek*, col. 27, line 42 - col. 28, line 13. However, neither this portion nor any other portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests monitoring content of mobile device communications on a data call and billing a user of the mobile device for accessing a URL requested for access based on a detected match of the requested URL with a particular URL. For at least these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22, 52 and 82 are patentable over *Sladek* and request that the rejection of Claims 22, 52 and 82 be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicants add new Claims 103-110. Claims 103-110 contain no new matter and are fully supported by the specification as filed.

Claim 103 recites "wherein the predefined event comprises a use of transmission resources in excess of a predefined amount." In the rejection of original Claim 4 which included a similar element, the Examiner cited to portions of *Sladek* that generally disclose modifying a subscriber's profile in order to aid in provisioning a subscriber service and activating or deactivating a service using a particular feature code. *See* Office Action, page 3 and *Sladek*, col. 17, lines 29-54 and col. 26, lines 30-49. However, neither these nor any other portions of *Sladek* disclose, teach or suggest detecting in monitored content of communications with the mobile device a use of transmission resources in excess of a predefined amount and initiating a wireless data call service in response to such detection. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 103 is allowable over the cited art used in the previous rejections.

Claims 104-109 each depends from Claim 103. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 104-109 are allowable over the cited art used in the previous rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 103.

In addition, Claim 104 recites "wherein the use of transmission resources in excess of a predefined amount comprises a use of transmission resources in a forward direction from the mobile device to a wireless network in excess of a predefined amount." In the rejection of original Claim 5 which included a similar element, the Examiner cited to a portion of *Sladek* that generally discloses a subscriber being able to activate or deactivate a service using a particular feature code. See Office Action, page 3 and *Sladek*, col. 26, lines 30-49. However, neither this nor any other portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests detecting in monitored content of communications with the mobile device a use of transmission resources in a forward direction in excess of a predefined amount and initiating a wireless data call service in response to such detection. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 104 is allowable over the cited art used in the previous rejections.

Furthermore, Claim 105 recites "wherein the use of transmission resources in excess of a predefined amount comprises a use of transmission resources in a reverse direction from a wireless network to the mobile device in excess of a predefined amount." In the rejection of original Claim 6 which included a similar element, the Examiner cited to a portion of *Sladek* that generally discloses modifying a subscriber's profile in order to aid in provisioning a subscriber service. See Office Action, page 3 and *Sladek*, col. 17, lines 29-54. However, neither this nor any other portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests detecting in monitored content of communications with the mobile device a use of transmission resources in a reverse direction from a wireless network in excess of a predefined amount and initiating a wireless data call service in response to such detection. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 105 is allowable over the cited art used in the previous rejections.

Moreover, Claim 106 recites "wherein the wireless data call service comprises a prepaid calling card service limiting access to the Internet based on the use of transmission resources." Claim 107, which depends from Claim 106, recites that the prepaid calling card service "limits

access to the Internet to a predefined amount of time;" and Claim 108, which depends from Claim 106, recites that the prepaid calling card service "limits access to the Internet to a predefined volume." No portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests initiating a prepaid calling card service limiting access to the Internet in response to detecting in monitored wireless data call content a predefined event. In addition, no portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests that the prepaid calling card service limits access to the Internet to a predefined amount of time or to a predefined volume.

In addition, Claim 109 recites "determining that a number of transmitted bytes exceeds the predefined number of transmission bytes," "transmitting any packets in a transmit queue" and "discarding subsequent packets received for transmission." *Sladek* does not disclose, teach or suggest these elements.

Moreover, Claim 110 recites "wherein the predefined event comprises a quality of service (QoS) reduction" and "wherein the wireless data call service comprises reducing a bill for a user of the mobile device." No portion of *Sladek* discloses, teaches or suggests detecting in monitored content of communications with the mobile device a quality of service reduction and initiating a service reducing a bill for a user of the mobile device in response to such QoS reduction detection.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 103-110.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER
062891.0482

PATENT
09/696,827

22

CONCLUSIONS

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Although no fees are believed to be currently due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Chad C. Walters
Reg. No. 48,022

Date: December 22, 2004

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6986

Customer Number: **05073**